## **REMARKS**

The Examiner objected to some of the claim and specification amendments of Amendment A under 35 U.S.C. §132. More specifically, the Examiner asserted that the amendments changing the relationship (2D/W) to (W/2D) constituted new matter. In response, Applicant has cancelled the specification amendments at issue and deleted the claims that include this relationship. Accordingly, withdrawal of this new matter rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has cancelled Claims 2-4, without prejudice, thereby rendering these rejections moot with respect to these claims. However, with respect to Claims 1 and 5-16, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Both the §112, first paragraph, rejection and the §112, second paragraph, rejection are related to the use of the phrase "so that the tire rotational side groove wall surface is continuously connected to the ground contact surface." In response to both rejections, Applicant has deleted the phrase at issue from independent Claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of these §112 rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 6-10 and 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over JP 6-166303 (JP '303) in view of EP 0 602 989 (EP '989). Claims 2-5

stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over JP '303 in view of EP '989 and further in view of JP 6-270609 (JP '609). Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over JP '303 in view of EP '989 and JP 64-36505 (JP '505). Claims 1 and 6-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over JP 62-026104 (JP '104) in view of JP '303 and EP '989. Claims 2-4 have been cancelled, thereby rendering any rejections of these claims moot. However, with respect to Claims 1 and 5-16, Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

In response to the §103 rejections, Applicant has amended Claim 1 to recite that the tire reverse rotational direction side edge portion is not chamfered. On page 11, lines 18-21 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner agreed that his proposed combination of JP '303 and EP '989 would include chamfers on both walls. Accordingly, as all of the features of independent Claim 1 are not disclosed or suggested in the cited references, Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejections of independent Claim 1 and associated dependent Claims 5-16 be withdrawn.

Additionally, Applicant has also added new independent Claim 17, which is a combination of Claim 1 (without language reciting that one side edge portion is not chamfered) and Claims 7, 9, 10, 11 and 15. Claim 11 was not included in any of the rejections based on JP '303, and Claim 15 was not included in any of the rejections based on JP '104. Combining Claims 11 and 15 into new Claim 17 (along with their associated base claim and the intervening claims) provides a claim that reads over both the rejections based on JP '303 and those based on JP '104. Applicant has also added new dependent Claims 18-

23, which each refer back to new independent Claim 17. Applicant respectfully submits that new Claims 17-23 should all be allowable over the references of record.

For all of the above reasons, Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of the claimed invention. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would aid in the prosecution of the application, or that outstanding issues exist, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By

James K. Folker

Registration No. 37,538

October 31, 2007

Suite 2500 300 South Wacker Drive Chicago, Illinois 60606 (312) 360-0080

Customer No. 24978 P:\DOCS\4386\77710\C57496.DOC